

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-18 remain pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Support for the amendment can be found throughout the specification and drawings. No new matter has been entered. For the reasons stated below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action mailed August 23, 2005, claims 1, 4-11 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0027572 to Karlsson et al. ("Karlsson"); and claims 2-3 and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Karlsson in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0123348 to Willars ("Willars"). To the extent these grounds of rejection might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to methods for overcoming an undesirable circumstance wherein a mobile (e.g., phone or device) will camp on to a competitor's network even though the home network provides wireless service at the very same location. This situation can occur where, for example, the competitor's network happens to broadcast a stronger base station signal compared to the base station signal of the home network. See, e.g., paragraph [0007] of the specification. To overcome this undesirable situation, the present invention interposes a Roaming Enhancement Node (REN) between a visited MSC/VLR and the mobile's home network's HLR. The REN intercepts Location Updating messages, extracts an included Location Area Identifier (LAI) and then determines, on a location-by-location basis, whether the

Location Updating message should be passed to the HLR for further processing. That is, the REN preferably includes a lookup table that lists all of the LAIs in which the home network should properly be providing service. When a visited MSC/VLR passes on a Location Updating message "believing" that the mobile will be serviced by the visited MSC/VLR, the REN can essentially deny the request if the home network has the ability to service that same location (LAI). See paragraph [0027]

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to even more clearly recite the features of the present invention, as outlined above. Claim 1, for example, now recites a method for controlling roaming in communication systems having overlapping coverage. The method calls for, among other things, provisioning a Roaming Enhancement Node (REN) in a mobile's home network, sending a LAI from a visited MSC/VLR to a HLR in the mobile's home network in an UpdateLocation message, intercepting the UpdateLocation message at the REN, and determining, at the REN, whether to continue registration of the mobile based at least in part on whether the home network provides coverage for the same LAI as the visited network.

Karlsson, the primary reference, is concerned with optimizing a network's paging broadcasts in the event of a failure of an MSC/VLR. See, e.g., paragraphs [0012] and [0013] of Karlsson. Karlsson is not at all concerned with ensuring that a home network actually services a particular mobile device. As such, Karlsson does not need (or therefore disclose) a Roaming Enhancement Node (REN) as described and claimed in the present application.

The secondary reference, Willars, while directed generally to similar subject matter of the present application (i.e., comparing LAIs), discloses comparing LAI lists on a mobile device

Serial No.: 10/699,733
Art Unit: 2682

Attorney's Docket No.: CING03-075
Page 8

itself (paragraph [0034]), not using a REN, which, as shown in, e.g., Figure 3, is actually a part of the infrastructure of the mobile's home network.


With the foregoing in mind, it is evident that neither Karlsson nor Willars, singly or in combination, discloses or suggests the subject matter of the present invention as recited in amended claims 1 and 11 and their respective dependent claims. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending §102(e) and §103(a) rejections.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

Respectfully submitted,
SASHIKALA DALVIE ET AL.

Date: November 22, 2005

By: 
Lawrence D. Eisen
Registration No. 41,009

Attachments: None

LDE/dkp

Customer No. 00909